

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-13 and 15 are currently pending. Claims 1, 6, 8, 9,10, 11, 12, 13, and 15 are hereby amended. No claims are added. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 6, 8-11, 13 and 15 are independent.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 6, 10, 13 and 15 were objected to as indefinite through use of the phrase “template/token.” Applicant hereby amends these claims to address the objection and submits that the objections are overcome.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4-6, 8-12, and 15

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 8-12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nazem et al. (United States Patent No. 5,983,227, hereafter “Nazem”), in view of Chan et al. (United States Patent No. 6,178,461, hereafter “Chan”)¹ Applicant hereby amends claims 1, 6,8,9,10, 11, and 15 to recite that the claimed tree is a syntax tree comprising templates and tokens representing data within a data file or HTML page. For example, Figures 3 and 4 of the present application illustrate trees populated with strings, values, and URL portions from within a retrieved page.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Chan nor Nazem teach or suggest a syntax tree comprising templates and tokens representing data from within a data file as required by claims 1, 4-6, 8-12, and 15. The Examiner admits that Nazem does not teach a tree corresponding to a data file (Office Action, p. 5). Chan describes a tree of web page URLs (Chan, Fig. 7) used to identify web pages which may potentially be similar to a requested page. However, the trees described by Chan store only the URLs of the pages (Chan, Fig. 7 and description). The trees described by Chan do not store data from within the data files as is required by the pending claims.

¹ The Examiner refers to Chan as “Chang” throughout the Office Action. Applicants have assumed that the number designation for the reference is correct, and have responded accordingly.

Further, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art modify the tree structure of Chan to include data from within a data file as doing so would alter the principle of operation of Chan. The tree described by Chan is used to identify pages which have highly similar URLs to a requested page, in accordance with the observation that pages with similar URL paths are likely to have similar content. Modifying these trees to include content from within a page would alter the syntax tree such that neighboring portions of the tree might no longer share the most similar URLs, with unpredictable results.

Moreover, since neither Chan nor Nazem teach or suggest a syntax tree comprising templates and tokens representing data from within the data file, neither do these references teach or suggest parsing the non-matching content of the received data file to form at least one subtree as is required by claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 13, and 15, or parsing the dynamic content to form subtrees as is required by claims 9 and 10.

Thus, neither Chan nor Nazem, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the limitations of a tree comprising templates and tokens “representing data within” a data file or HTML page as required by amended claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 15. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that the rejection of these claims as obvious in view of Nazem and Chan is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claim 13

The Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Nazem and Chan, and further in view of Livingston et al. (United States Patent No. 6,424,979, hereafter “Livingston.” Applicants hereby amend claim 13 to recite that the claimed tree is a syntax tree comprising templates and tokens representing data within a data file.

As argued above, neither Nazem nor Chan teach or suggest a parsing engine parsing non-matching content of a received data file to form at least one subtree as is required by claim 13, and those argument are incorporated here as if fully set forth herein.

Applicant respectfully submits that Livingston also does not teach or suggest parsing non-matching content of a received data file to form at least one subtree as is required by claim

13. Although the Examiner notes that Livingston (U.S. Patent 6,424,979) describes using a tree structure to represent file content (Office Action, p. 12; Livingston., Fig. 9), the system described by Livingston is intended to receive only sporadic updates from users, since the updates may require significant human research involvement (Livingston, col. 9 lines 10-30). These updates may be incorporated into a tree structure manually--“the form is routed to a human supervisor” (Livingston, col. 9, lines 30-38)—or incorporated by parsing an entire update to determine if “the new text can be stored in the exact same structure as the old text.” (Livingston, col. 9, lines 25-30). The system contemplated by Livingston thus does not parse non-matching content to form new subtrees since human intervention is required to incorporate any data not structured in exactly the same way (Livingston, col. 9, lines 30-38). Further, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Livingston to parse non-matching content of a received data file to form at least one subtree, as Livingston is designed to operate in an environment where updates are relatively infrequent and human verification is needed before changes are made to pages seen by users (See Livingston, Fig. 6, requiring supervisor review of “all pages affected by updated content”) Thus, Livingston does not teach or suggest parsing non-matching content of a received data file as is required by claim 13.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Please charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayments, to our Deposit Account No. 03-1721.

Respectfully submitted,
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP

/John D. Lanza/
John D. Lanza
Registration No. 40,060

Patent Group
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Tel: (617) 248-5000
Fax: (617) 248-4000
Date: March ____, 2007